

IN THE DRAWINGS

Formal drawings are submitted herewith.

REMARKS

Applicant's amended claim 1 should obviate Examiner's "112" rejection of claims 1-6.

Examiner rejected claims 1-20 under 35 USC 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-16 of Applicant's prior U.S. Patent No. 5,036,524 ('524).

Applicant traverses Examiner's rejections for the reason that claims 1-20 are not identical to claims 1-16 of '524.

However, instead of a straight double patenting rejection, Examiner could more reasonably have rejected claims 1-20 under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting.

In anticipation of such a rejection by Examiner, Applicant provides herewith a Terminal Disclaimer; which is sufficient to overcome an obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

The fee for the Terminal Disclaimer is provided-for by the enclosed check (#4073) for \$55.00.



Ole K. Nilssen, Pro Se Applicant

BEST AVAILABLE COPY